

**Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

Requestor's Name and Address: PRESBYTERIAN PLANO PO BOX 910812 DALLAS TX 75391	MFDR Tracking #: M4-05-3066-01
	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
	Date of Injury:
Respondent Name and Box #: TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO Rep Box # 54	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Requestor's Position Summary: "The following claim was processed however, I do not feel that the claim was processed and paid correctly. The following claim was paid at a 12% discount. I do not feel that 12% is neither a fair nor a reasonable rate for this Hospital. We have done extensive research and found that most hospitals in this area pay 75% - 85% of the billed charges. I am requesting that this claim be reprocessed and paid at this rate. If additional monies is not paid or documentation showing why additional monies not paid, then a dispute well be filed with TWCC."

Principal Documentation:

1. DWC 60 Package
2. Total Amount Sought - \$73.09
3. Hospital Bill
4. EOBs

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Respondent's Position Summary: "The reimbursement amounts for the lab tests (80053, 85025, 85610, 85652, 85730) were based on the 2004 TWCC fee schedule reimbursement rate for each code. Reimbursement for code 93005 was based on the 2003 TWCC fee schedule reimbursement. TWCC Rule 134.202 states in part, '(b) For coding, billing, reporting, and reimbursement of professional medical services, Texas Workers' Compensation system participants shall apply the Medicare program reimbursement methodologies, models, and values or weights including its coding, billing, and reporting payment policies in effect on the date a service is provided with any additions or exceptions in this section.'" "The TWCC Medical Fee Guideline, is required to be fair and reasonable per Section 413.011(d) which states, 'Guidelines for medical services must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control...' The requester has provided no information to support that the TWCC fee schedules are not fair and reasonable."

Principal Documentation:

1. Response Package

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
12/29/2003	M, RD	Outpatient Laboratory and Diagnostic Services	\$73.09	\$0.00
Total /Due:				\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:
 - M, RD-The reimbursement for the service rendered has been determined to be fair and reasonable based on billing and payment research and is in accordance with Labor Code 413.011(B).
2. This dispute relates to outpatient radiological services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(a)(3), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, which states that “Services such as outpatient physical therapy, radiological studies and laboratory studies are not covered by this guideline and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific services.”
3. Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that “reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers’ Compensation Act, §413.011.”
4. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual’s behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires that the request shall include “a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier for reconsideration in accordance with §133.304.” This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on December 27, 2004. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not submitted a copy of the original bill. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form, format, and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires that the request shall include “a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB) or response to the refund request relevant to the dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB.” Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided a copy of the EOB detailing the insurance carrier’s response to the request for reconsideration. Nor has the requestor provided evidence of carrier receipt of the request for an EOB. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “documentation of the request for and response to reconsideration (when a provider is requesting dispute resolution on a carrier reduction or denial of a medical bill) or, if the carrier failed to respond to the request for reconsideration, convincing evidence of the carrier’s receipt of that request” Pursuant to §133.307(g)(3), the Division notified the requestor on December 30, 2004 to send the additional required documentation. Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not provided documentation of the insurance carrier’s response to the request for reconsideration or convincing evidence of the carrier’s receipt of that request. The Division concludes that the requestor has not provided documentation sufficient to meet the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “a copy of any pertinent medical records”... Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not sent a copy of any pertinent medical records. The Division concludes that the requestor has not provided documentation sufficient to meet the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include: (i) a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute, (ii) the requestor’s reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid or refunded, (iii) how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues, and (iv) how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not discuss or explain how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues, or how the submitted documentation supports the requestor’s position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that requestor has not provided documentation sufficient to meet the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C).
10. Division Rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment

amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §133.1 of this title (relating to Definitions) and §134.1 of this title (relating to Use of the Fee Guidelines)". The requestor's position summary asserts that "I do not feel that 12% is neither a fair nor a reasonable rate for this Hospital. We have done extensive research and found that most hospitals in this area pay 75% - 85% of the billed charges. " However, the requestor does not explain how payment of 75% of billed charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for these services in dispute. The requestor did not submit documentation to support the rationale for increased reimbursement or a listing of the hospitals that pay 75% - 75% of the billed charges. The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would ensure the quality of medical care, achieve effective medical cost control, provide for payment that is not in excess of a fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living, consider the increased security of payment, or otherwise satisfy the statutory requirements and Division rules. Additionally, the Division has determined that a reimbursement methodology based upon a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

"A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources."

Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not discussed, demonstrated or justified that payment in the amount sought by the requestor would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

11. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(A), §133.307(e)(2)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(A), §133.307(g)(3)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C) and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), § 413.031 and § 413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1, §133.304, §133.1, §134.401
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

2/19/2010

Authorized Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division Rule 148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code Section 413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code Section 413.031.

Si prefieres hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.